





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. SON 1459 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
08/900,254		07/25/1997	PETER PFEUFFER	22750/350	22750/350 7919	
26646	7590	07/29/2003				
KENYON		ON	EXAMINER			
ONE BROA		0004		YAO, SAMCHUAN CUA		
		•		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				1733	42	
				DATE MAILED: 07/29/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			MK-43
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
. Advisory Action	08/900,254	PFEUFFER, PETER	
, Marioofy Modern	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sam Chuan C. Yao	1733	
Th MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cov r sheet with the	correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 21 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TO THE REPLY FILED 21 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TO THE FORM TO PLACE TO THE FORM TO PLACE TO PL	avoid abandonment of this appli (1) a timely filed amendment wh	cation. A proper reply to a ich places the application in	ued
PERIOD FOR R	REPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAY 706.07(f).	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date	of the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The chave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extended from: (1) the expiration date of the shortent (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three nearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount of the ed statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extension fee the final Office action; or (2) as set	e under forth in
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellan 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 C</li> </ol>			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	because:		
(a) 🛮 they raise new issues that would require furt	her consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);	
(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	e below);		
<ul><li>(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or simplifyi	ng the
(d) they present additional claims without cance	eling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ection(s):		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	ld be allowable if submitted in a	separate, timely filed amend	iment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request f application in condition for allowance because: §		sidered but does NOT place	the the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLEL`	f to issues which were newly	y
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendme explanation of how the new or amended claims v			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	s:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on i	is a)□ approved or b)□ disap	proved by the Examiner.	
9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statem	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).		
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
		700	
		Sam Chuan C. Yao Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1733	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-303 (Rev. 04-01) Continuation Sheet (PTO-303) 008/900,254



Continuation of 2. NOTE: The newly added limitation raises a new issue which requires further consideration and search...

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments are based on a proposed amendment that was NOT entered. Hence, Counsel's arguments are NOT commensurate with the scope of the recited claims which were considered in prior office actions.